

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Support for the amendment to claims 1, 5 and 6 is found on page 10, lines 1-2 of the specification. Support for claims 15 and 16 is found on page 17, lines 22-24 of the specification. Support for claims 17, 20 and 23 is found on page 19, lines 10-15 of the specification. Support for claims 18-19 is found on page 19, lines 20-24 of the specification. Support for claims 21-22 is found on page 20, lines 9-11 of the specification. Support for claims 24-25 is found on page 20, lines 12-16 of the specification. No new matter would be added to this application by entry of this amendment.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-6 and 14-25 will now be active in this application.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

The present invention is directed to a composition for external application comprising a diamide compound.

Applicants wish to thank examiner Yu for allowing claim 2 and indicating that claims 3 and 14 are allowable, if written in independent form. Applicants note that claim 3 is already dependent on allowed claim 2 and therefore no amendment is necessary. As to claim 14, this claim has been written in independent form.

The rejection of claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kovacs et al. U.S. 5,932,630 is respectfully traversed.

Kovacs et al is directed to an ink composition containing a triblock copolymer as a vehicle for dye or pigment (column 10, lines 3-15). The triblock copolymer is present in an amount of from 60-99 wt. % (column 10, lines 8-9). Accordingly, the reference only suggests a composition containing from 60-99 wt. % of copolymer. A composition containing from 0.001 to 50 wt. % is not suggested by the prior art.

Application No. 10/082,115
Reply to Office Action of December 18, 2003

In contrast, the present invention is directed to a composition for external application comprising 0.001 to 50 wt. % of a diamide compound. Applicants note that the claims have been amended to recite an amount of diamide compound of from 0.001 to 50 wt.% in the composition. As the cited reference only suggest a composition containing from 60-99 wt.% of triblock copolymer, a composition containing a lower amount of only 0.001 top 50 wt. % is simply not suggested. In view of the deficiencies of the cited reference withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kovaks et al. is moot.

Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance and early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Chinn, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,305

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)